

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 22, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-8, 17-28 and 34-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended in a non-narrowing manner to address the items raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 16 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Krachman. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "the evidentiary outline including a party's position and a link to evidence stored in the database supporting the party's position, the link created by a contributor having authority to modify legal information in the database." In embodiments of the invention, the information in the database evidence supporting a party's position is inserted into the database and linked to by a contributor as described in at least page 7, lines 5-20 of Applicants' specification. Krachman fails to teach or suggest this feature. In Krachman, AI is used to search documents based on a query. The search results are presented to the user as a series of links to documents as shown in Figure 10 of Krachman. Krachman, however, does not teach that links are created in the database between a party's position and evidence supporting that position. Thus, Krachman fails to teach the elements of claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Krachman. Claims 16 and 33 recite similar features as claim 1 and are patentable over Krachman for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 30-32 depend from claim 16 and are patentable over Krachman for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-15, 17-28 and 34-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Krachman in view of Griggs. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Griggs was relied upon for disclosing different access rights for clients and contributors, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Krachman discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Krachman in view of Griggs for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 17-28 depend from claim 16 and are patentable over Krachman in view of Griggs for at least the reasons advanced


DBH-0001

with reference to claim 16. Claims 34-46 depend from claim 33 and are patentable over Krachman in view of Griggs for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 33

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

Date: February 21, 2006

DBH-0001